Of Drinking
In Remembrance
Of The Dead
-1713-

D-26
B8175

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 10 1973
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SCC
1733

OF DRINKING IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE DEAD.

BEING

The Substance of a DISCOURSE Deliver'd to the CLERGY of the Diocese of *CORK*, on the Fourth of *November*, 1713. by the Bishop of that Diocese. And Published at their Unanimous Request.

Peter Browne Bp. of Cork and Ross

LONDON: Read.

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the *Oxford-Arms* in *Warwick-Lane*. MDCCXIII.

Price Six-pence.

3181
BD 11
9/9/1919

Of Drinking in Remembrance of the DEAD, &c.

THE Queſtion I am now to ſpeak to, is this:

Whether Drinking in Remembrance of the Dead, excepting only in Remembrance of Jeſus Chriſt, is an Action in it ſelf Sinful, now under the Goſpel? And whether the Cuſtom of Drinking in Remembrance of a Departed Monarch, is ſo in particular? Aff.

I ſhall, by way of Preface, only obſerve to you, That were it not for the Power and Prejudice of a Cuſtom which has lately prevailed, thro' much Inadvertency and Want of a pious Zeal and ſincere Concern for Religion, in the Hearts of Men, it wou'd be look'd upon as a very needleſs Work, to go about to prove the Affirmative of this Queſtion.

Had we liv'd in any other Age ſince Chriſt, the very Propoſing of it wou'd have ſtartled all good Chriſtians. They wou'd immediately ſay, I was going about to de-

monſtrate a ſelf-evident Truth, which no body doubted; I ſhou'd have met with no other Return, but, Who denies it? And it will certainly come about to this again, whenever Truth and Loyalty ſhall triumph over Infidelity and Faction.

The Queſtion is not,

1*ſt*, Whether we may have an Honourable Remembrance of great and worthy Perſons; and perpetuate the Memory of ſuch as have been uſeful and exemplary in their Lives, by promoting the Honour of God and Religion, and the Good of their Country? This was the Deſign of the Diptychs in the Primitive Church, and is countenanced and encouraged in Scripture, which propoſes it as a Reward conſequent to Virtue and Goodneſs in this Life; and ſays, That *the Righteous ſhall be had in everlaſting Remembrance.*

Nor, 2*dly*, Whether we are to be well affected to the late Revolution? Tho' we cannot ſo far limit the Power and Wiſdom of God, as to ſay, that he could not have delivered us by any other Means or Methods more advantageous; yet whoſoever conſiders that it was the Hand of God, a remarkable Diſpenſation of his Providence, and the Method by which he choſe to work ſo great a Deliverance for us, muſt not only acquieſce in it, but return God the Glory of ſo great and general a Bleſſing. But, if we magni-

magnify it only as a *Revolution*, and not as it was the ſaving us from Deſtruction; then the next Revolution may be the overturning our whole Conſtitution in Church and State.

Nor 3*dly*, Whether we ought to honour the Memory of King *William*! All People who own the late great Deliverance theſe Nations have had from Popery and Arbitrary Power, muſt likewiſe acknowledge our late Sovereign, of Glorious Memory, to have been the Happy Inſtrument in the Hand of God for bringing all that to paſs. And one way of expreſſing our Gratitude to God, is, by an Honourable Remembrance of thoſe by whom his Bleſſings were convey'd to us. So that if we ſet up Statues, erect Trophies, raiſe Pyramids, ring Bells annually, and magnify him in Encomiums, Diſcourſe and Hiſtory, I ſee nothing in all this ſinful in the Nature of the Thing; tho' it may become accidentally ſo; as particularly, when any thing of this is done with a diſloyal or factious Deſign.

Nor, 4*thly*, Whether drinking ſuch a Health is a Sacrament? or whether it is done Sacramentally? But whether the very Action it ſelf of Drinking, applied to the Memory of the Dead, is made Sacramental? For if the Action it ſelf is made Sacramental, then the Conſequence is clear, that it muſt be a horrid Abuſe of it, to prophane it to any civil

civil or common Uſe. As clear, as that if a Houſe is dedicated to God, we cannot apply it to common Uſe without Prophanation and Sacrilege; only with this Difference, that the Deſecration of the former, is a Guilt of a much deeper Dye, and of a more abominable Nature.

Nor, *5thly*, Whether we may remember any abſent Friend, or our Sovereign, by wiſhing them Health and Proſperity when we drink, as the Cuſtom is? This may be innocently done; not but that one hearty and warm Ejaculation for them will do them more Service; however, by this we may ſhew our good Will and our Loyalty. But the Queſtion is, whether if my Friend or my Monarch were dead, I may, without Sin, perpetuate his Memory, by a Cuſtom of Drinking in Remembrance of him; and that with the Epithets of Dear, or Glorious, or Immortal, or Pious, *&c.* This is what I take to be highly ſinful.

Now we need go no farther for the Proof of the Sinfulneſs of this Practice, than the expreſs Words of Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25, 26. *This cup is the new teſtament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do ſhew the Lord's death till he come.* From which theſe ſeveral things are very plain.

1*ſt*, That

1*ſt*, That Drinking to the Memory of a Perſon dead, is the moſt profound Myſtery of the Goſpel, and Foundation of our whole Chriſtianity. All the Diſpenſations of God from the Beginning of the World were center'd in that Death of Chriſt which we drink to, and are compleated by it. Therefore he calls the Cup, *The new teſtament in my blood*, i. e. No leſs than that Covenant of Pardon and Salvation, which you have in my Blood ſhed for you on the Croſs.

2*dly*, That the Drinking to the Memory of a Perſon dead, is an Action made Sacramental; 'tis adopted into Religion, and conſecrated to the Glorious Memory of Chriſt only. And that by an expreſs Command and ſolemn Inſtitution, *Do this in remembrance of me.*

3*dly*, That the very Eſſence of the Euchariſtical Sacrifice, conſiſts in that Action of Eating and Drinking to the Memory of a Perſon once dead. 'Tis not the Drinking, nor drinking Wine and Water, or both mixt, or ſitting, or ſtanding, or kneeling; no, nor the doing it religiouſly, or by way of Praiſe or Thankſgiving even to God; all theſe are but appendant Circumſtances. 'Tis in the Drinking to the *Memory* of Chriſt's Death, in which the very Life and Being of that Sacrament conſiſts. 'Tis the ſhewing *forth the Lord's death till he come*, that conſtitutes it a Sacrament. 'Tis the very Ground and Reaſon

Reaſon of the Inſtitution, that which makes it myſterious and obligatory on all Chriſtians, till his Coming to Judgment.

If it ſaid here, That the very Form or eſſential Part of that Sacrament, is in Drinking to the Remembrance of Chriſt's *Death* only, *i. e.* to his very Act of Dying for us; but that in Drinking to the Glorious Memory of a dead Monarch, we mean not to celebrate his Death, but the Glorious Actions of his Life; and therefore that this can be no prophaning of that Sacrament in that very Inſtance which is moſt eſſential to it. I anſwer, That if we could abſtract the Perſon of Chriſt from his Death; could celebrate his Death without remembring him dead, and what he did for us when alive; or if we could drink to the Memory of a dead Man, without implying and neceſſarily including his Death, there wou'd be a faint Colour of an Objection. But how can we ſhew the Lord's Death, without ſhewing the Lord that died, that was alive, and then did great Things for us? And perhaps 'tis to obviate this very Objection, that the Words of the Inſtitution are not, Do this, as oft as ye Drink it, in Remembrance of my DEATH; but in Remembrance of ME.

Ay! but ſays one, the Caſe is ſtill different; for Chriſt is now alive, but the Monarch to whoſe Memory we drink, continues

tinues dead. Yes, and for that very Reaſon we are to celebrate him once dead, *who only has Immortality* ; and that too in a way never to be apply'd to any meerly Mortal Creature. But away with theſe Subtilties in the moſt important Action of our Lives here ; and upon which the Salvation of our Souls hereafter ſo much depends. We remember Chriſt, and him dead, by drinking in Remembrance of him ; Whoſoever hopes to be ſav'd by ſo doing, let him take care how he does the ſame to any other Perſon whatſoever. For tho' it be not done in the ſame Manner, or with the ſame Deſign, nor with the ſame Circumſtances ; yet that ſtill remains, in which the very Being and Eſſence of our holy Euchariſt conſiſts.

And now can it be a Doubt, whether an Action ſo holy ; dedicated to the Memory of our Bleſſed Saviour ; conſecrated to ſuch Divine Purpoſes ; and made the very Teſt of our Chriſtian Profeſſion, may be apply'd to common Uſe, and made an Expreſſion of civil Reſpect and Complement to the Perſon or Character of whomſoever we pleaſe to apply it to : Every ſincere Conſcience, truly touch'd with a Senſe of Religion, will ſoon determine this Point without any great reach of Underſtanding or ſtock of Learning. The plaineſt and moſt obvious Reaſon is the ſtrongeſt ; and tho' it may be darkned and perplex'd by a multitude of

Words, or argued away ; yet the Truth will not be totally extinguiſh'd, but will recur again. Tho' it be thus repell'd for a time, it will recoil with uneaſineſs upon the Mind, at every ſerious fit of Thinking; and never ſuffer a laſting Conviction there, till the very Conſcience is defil'd, and hath no ſincere Regard for Religion left. If I ſhould ask any plain, but ſincere Chriſtian, this ſhort Queſtion, Whether what Chriſt has commanded to be done ſacramentally and religiouſly in Remembrance of him, may, without Sin, be done to any other Perſon whatſoever, in Remembrance of them? He wou'd anſwer, No ſurely, not without Wonder and Indignation at the Queſtion; for that would be to honour a Man as I do Chriſt. And this is what all the Logick in the World will never anſwer.

However, to fit the Argument for the Genius of the Diſputers of this World, I will reduce the whole Conteſt to a Point, in one or two Syllogiſms.

If Chriſt has appropriated that Action of drinking to the Memory of the Dead, to his own Perſon ; it is highly ſinful to apply it to any other.

But Chriſt has appropriated drinking to the Memory of the Dead, to his own Perſon, *Ergò*.

I ſup-

I ſuppoſe the conſequence of the Major will never be deny'd by any one who underſtands the Terms of it. And for the Minor, 'tis prov'd thus.

If Chriſt has inſtituted that Action in Honour of himſelf, he has appropriated it to his own Perſon.
But Chriſt has inſtituted it in Honour of himſelf. *Ergò.*

The Minor is deny'd by no Sect of People who call themſelves Chriſtians, but the Quakers. And if any Man denies the conſequence of the Major, let him ſhew what other way there was of appropriating an Action to the Perſon of Chriſt, beſides an expreſs Inſtitution, and Conſecration of it into a Sacrament.

Now if it be ſaid that they want an expreſs Command, that it ſhall be done to him only, *and not to any one elſe.* I anſwer, There was no occaſion for an expreſs Command for that which the common Reaſon of Mankind muſt naturally ſuggeſt. However, 'tis ſaid in Scripture, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* And if that Action of drinking to the Memory of the Dead, be now made the moſt Solemn Act of Worſhip and Adoration, as it really is; then they are not without an expreſs Command; and the apply-

ing of that Action to any other Person, is a manifest Transgression of this Precept.

4. And this brings me to the fourth thing contained in those Texts, namely, That this drinking in Remembrance of the Dead is appropriated to Christ, not only by virtue of a Solemn Institution and Command, which of their own nature restrain it to him, and make it highly sinful to apply it to any other Person; but there is Provision made for this in the very Form of that Institution; and this Limitation is made in express Words, very plain to that effect in the Original, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. The literal and easy Translation of which is this: As often as ye shall drink thus, do it in Remembrance of me. The import is the same in the Translation of our *English* Bible; *This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me*: Only with this difference, that the Drift and Design of that ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε is not set in so plain a light.

The use which is generally made of that Clause, is from thence to urge the frequency of receiving the Sacrament; which is of it self a thing sufficiently plain from the nature of it, and the infinite Advantages we receive by it. And tho' this is a good Inference, yet it is not so direct as that for which the Clause was chiefly and originally intended; namely, to restrain this Action

of

of Drinking to the Memory of a dead Perſon, to that of our Saviour; and to prevent its ever being done to any one elſe: And to confirm this, the Word ὁσάκις is repeated in the next Verſe, and the Reaſon of this Reſtriction aſſign'd; *For as often as ye do this, ye ſhew forth the Lord's Death*; *i. e.* It is an Action conſecrated to the Memory of the Lord.

This Clauſe ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε, was left out of ſome Ancient Copies, and particularly the *Æthiopick* Verſion and *Alexandrian* Manuſcript; becauſe it ſeem'd incoherent, needleſs, and to interrupt and perplex the Senſe. But this *Fooliſhneſs of God is wiſer than Men*, who foreſaw that in After-ages an Action ſo conſecrated to the moſt Holy and Divine Purpoſes, and in Memory of our Lord, wou'd be apply'd to Civil and Prophane Uſe, as it is now moſt ſhameſully at this Day. And it is very remarkable, that this Clauſe is left out in the Inſtitution of the Bread, and apply'd only to the Cup; with Deſign, in the Purpoſe and Fore-knowledge of God, to be an invincible Argument to all future Generations, for the Truth of that Doctrine I am now defending. As the Words, *Drink ye ALL of this*, were, no doubt, levell'd by the ſame Wiſdom, at that Sacrilegious Cuſtom in the Church of *Rome*, of denying the Cup to the Laity.

Now

Now tho' there are not those restraining Words in the Consecration of the Bread; yet if a Company of Christians shou'd, after Dinner, have a Piece of Bread distributed to every one of them; and each of them, in their Turn, put it into their Mouths with this Expression; *Here is to the Glorious Memory of King* William: This wou'd shock, and every one wou'd cry out upon it, as horrid and blasphemous in the Implication: And yet this you see does not come up to that Impiety, of doing the like with the Wine.

But to make the Case plainer yet, if there be Occasion for it, let us take a parallel Instance in the other Sacrament; and suppose that Dipping, or Sprinkling, were made a Form of Admission into any Civil Coporation: The very Essence of that Sacrament consists in Admitting Persons Members of the Church, which is a Body Corporate. I ask then, Whether this would not be, not only a Lessening and an Abuse of that Action, but also a most heinous and impious Prophanation of it? And why? Because Water is apply'd in that very Instance wherein the Essence of that Sacrament consists; which is, the Admission of Persons into a Visible Body.

No more need be said upon this Subject, for the Conviction of such as are in a Disposition to be convinc'd: God has made no Provi-

Proviſion, by way of Remedy, for Wilfulneſs and Obſtinacy. Such as are ſelf-will'd, and abound in their own Senſe, there is no Help for them; they muſt live and die full of themſelves, and their own Opinion.

Tho' we were not able to anſwer all the Objections which ſuch Perſons make, yet this is no Reaſon why we ſhould part with a plain Truth. But the Caſe is ſo far otherwiſe, that all the Objections and Inſtances made againſt it, do but conduce to the farther Confirmation of it, and ſetting it in a clearer Light.

Obj. 1*ſt.* We keep Feaſts in Memory of the Saints. *Anſw.* But not to pay them the ſame Honour we do to Chriſt. And therefore, let us inſtance in the greateſt Saint in Heaven, the Virgin *Mary*; and ſuppoſe that after Dinner or Supper, on her Day, a Company of zealous and devout Chriſtians ſhou'd each of them take a Cup or Glaſs of Wine, and in their Turn drink it with theſe Words, *Here is to the Glorious Memory of the Bleſſed Virgin* Mary; and then bring themſelves off with the Popiſh Diſtinction, ſaying, They mean not the *Cultus Latriæ*; no, God forbid! They mean no more by it than Honouring ſo great a Saint, to whom they are under infinite Obligations. After all their nice Diſquiſitions upon Civil, Religious, and Divine Honours,

the

the Answer would be in short, That of all Honours paid to her, this ought to be avoided; because 'tis the most solemn way we have of Honouring Christ himself; so that this wou'd be in it self a worse Idolatry than that of the Church of *Rome*. The Papists only kneel and pray to her; but this wou'd be, in no small degree, applying to her that which is made the most Solemn Act of Worship and Adoration to the Divinity.

2*dly*, They don't do this Religiously, *i. e.* by way of Paying K. *William* any Divine Honour. But can't Men pay Divine Honours, without designing them so? Hath any thing been more common among Heathen and Papists? And did they not both ever make the same Excuse for their Idolatry? If they drank that Health with such a design, this wou'd be a grievous Aggravation of that Action, and they wou'd be worse than *Turks* or *Jews*. The Question is not, Whether this Action may have many circumstantial Aggravations, from the different Uses Men make of it? But whether the Action it self, which is consecrated to so Divine an Use, may be apply'd to any Civil Purpose whatsoever. The Question is not, Whether they do it Religiously? But whether they should ever do it otherwise than Religiously, and after the manner instituted by Christ?

3*dly*, Ano-

3*dly*, Another objects, He has no Intention of prophaning the Sacrament by that Custom. All that can be inferr'd from this, is, Therefore he is not worse than an Heathen. This is another Aggravation. There have been many Aggravations of that sinful Action, as particularly, *Drinking to the Glorious and Immortal Memory* of a dead Monarch upon Men's Knees, and before his Statue; and in these Words, *I drink this in Remembrance*, &c. and by the Title of *Saviour*, taking off their Hats when they do it, &c. And there may be yet worse Uses made of it; and too probably there will, by the Enemies of REVELATION; who can't be ignorant, that applying that Action of Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, to civil or common Use, strikes at the very Root and Foundation of all Christianity; and have already taken Occasion from this very Practice, to say, in Contempt of our Holy Eucharist, that it is no more than an HEALTH. The Devil has Views in palliating and promoting sinful Customs, which we can't see to the End of; and no Man can tell what Consequences this will yet have, now it is once set on foot, or where it will end.

4*thly*, Another says, Drinking to the Memory of a dead Monarch cannot be Sacramental, because it has not all the Circumstances of that Sacrament. Who says it is?

The Question is not, Whether it is Sacramental? but whether 'tis a grievous Abuse and Prophanation of that which is truly so? And whether it ought ever to be done but Sacramentally, and with those Circumstances of Consecration, &c. and as our Saviour did institute it?

5thly, Says another, The Case is not parallel. There is no shedding of Blood in the Case of K. *William*. True; but the Action is exactly parallel in that very Instance wherein the Being of that Sacrament consists. And 'tis that which makes it sinful, to use the same Action by way of Civil Honour.

6thly, Says another, We *kneel* to God, and we *kneel* to Man; and this shews the same Action may be us'd both in a Religious and a Civil way. True; and so may Drinking; and what then? But neither of them in Honour of the Dead; so that this does not touch the Question; which is not about Drinking or Kneeling to the Honour of one or the other; for the Nature of the thing will be alter'd, as you design a Religious, or a Civil Worship by either of those Actions. The Question is about Drinking *in Remembrance of the Dead*; Whether, this being consecrated to a Religious Worship, you may apply that very Action in that very manner, to paying a purely Civil Respect. All you have to do here, is to distinguish between a Cere-

Ceremony which is in its own Nature indifferent, and a Sacrament which is not so: And therefore let us make the Case parallel, and then see how those who make this Objection, will like it. Suppose, that to that Text of Scripture, *At the Name of Jesus, every Knee shall bow*, a solemn express Institution had been added, so as to make Kneeling Sacramental, in these Words, *Do this, as oft as ye shall kneel, in remembrance of me.* Wou'd Christians kneel in Remembrance of any other Person dead? No sure; and Why? Because Kneeling, from being a common Posture of Reverence and Respect, whether to God or Man, wou'd have alter'd its Nature, and become the most solemn Act of Praise and Adoration, which cou'd be paid to the Divinity. So that you see the Objection goes upon a gross Mistake; for it is not Drinking, or Kneeling, in Honour of God or of Men, that is blameable; but Drinking or Kneeling to the Dead.

But if it be still objected, that Kneeling is in that *Phil.* 2. and 10. commanded to be perform'd to Christ; and therefore may not, for the same Reason, be us'd in Civil Worship. I answer, We must distinguish between a *Metaphorical* Expression, design'd to denote the lowest Reverence that can be paid by all Intelligent Beings; and Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, which is a *literal* and *positive* Institution.

But ſuppoſe I had ſaid nothing more in Anſwer to this formidable Objection, only have diſtinguiſh'd between Kneeling to the *Living*, and Kneeling to the *Dead*; and allow'd, that Kneeling to the Living may be uſed in Civil Worſhip, but not to the Dead; and by reaſon of that very Text, *At the name of Jeſus, every knee ſhall bow.* And why? Becauſe Bowing the Knee at the Name of a departed Perſon, is paying a Divine Honour; and therefore tho' they bowed the Knee to K. *William* when alive, yet it wou'd be rank Idolatry to bow the Knee to the Name of K. *William* now he is dead. And if the Caſe be ſo glaringly true in this Inſtance, which hath neither a poſitive Form of Inſtitution, nor expreſs Words to limit the Action to Chriſt alone; how much more is it ſo in that Action of Drinking to the Remembrance of the Dead, which hath both? And how plain is it, that to apply this to any other Perſon, wou'd be, in its own Nature, an idolatrous Act, however Men deſign'd it.

7thly, Another ſays, He knows Drinking to the Glorious or Immortal Memory, *&c.* to be ſinful; and therefore he drinks a Health only, *To all thoſe that love and honour the Memory of K.* William. Some ſtick to the firſt Form, *viz. To the Glorious and Immortal Memory of K.* William; *to all that lov'd him when alive, and honour his Memo-*

Memory now he is dead. Others who are ſhock'd at this, drink only to the *Glorious Memory*, but leave out *Immortal.* Others, To *all that love and honour the Memory*, &c. And in ſhort, this Health has been put into ſeveral Shapes and Forms, to avoid the Profaneneſs and viſible Impiety of it; and every one, according to the Regard he has left for the bleſſed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, gives it yet a ſofter turn. But is not this ſporting with things ſacred? Does not every one ſee, that all this is ſtill the ſame horrid and impious Profanation of that very Action which is conſecrated to the Memory of Chriſt alone. For, let them word it how they will, and put it into what Form they pleaſe, this no way alters the Nature of the Action; becauſe 'tis ſtill drinking in an *honourable Remembrance of the dead.* 'Tis all one whether they drink to the Death of K. *William*; to K. *William* dead; or his glorious Actions when alive; or to the glorious Memory; or to the immortal Memory; or to all that love the Memory, *&c.* ſtill there is Application made of the Action of drinking, to a meer Man, in that very manner which ought never to be applied but to the Perſon of Chriſt.

Obj. 8. Another Objection is from that Text of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 21. *Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of Devils.*

vils. Here ſay they, the *Cup of the Lord* is oppos'd only to the *Cup of Devils*; *i. e.* a Cup drank in religious Worſhip to Idols. What then? *Ergò* drinking in honour of others, beſides Chriſt, is condemn'd only as it is done religiouſly, or with an idolatrous Deſign. But this is all a Miſtake of the Text, and of the Apoſtle's Application of it. If there were no other Argument for what I am aſſerting, one wou'd think the very mention of this Text, ſhou'd be ſufficient to ſtrike the Conſcience of any good Man, and fill him with Horror at the Thoughts of honouring the dead by drinking to their Memory, when he conſiders,

1*ſt*, That this was ſpoke to *Chriſtians*, who cou'd not have drank that Cup which he condemns, by way of religious Worſhip; and if they had, the Apoſtle wou'd have then charg'd them with downright wilful Idolatry.

2*dly*, That *Chriſtians* cou'd not be ſuppos'd to have done it with intention to profane the *Euchariſt*. And this is the Reaſon, as appears by the Context, why the Apoſtle informs them of the ſinfulneſs of what they did; tho' they did it neither with intention of Idol-Worſhip, nor of prophaning that Sacrament.

3*dly*, That the very Reaſon of that ſevere Expreſſion, The *Cup of Devils*, was becauſe they who drank the *Cup of the Lord*,

Lord, *i.e.* in Remembrance of him, could not apply that Action of Drinking, after the same manner any other way, without the highest Prophanation of that Holy Institution. To which we may add,

4*thly*, That their departed Heroes were the Deities mostly worshipp'd by the Heathen; and that this Cup here condemn'd, must have been a Cup drank in an honourable Remembrance of them. For otherwise the Antithesis is lost here; and the two Cups in this Text are not rightly oppos'd one to the other; and so the whole Stress of the Apostle's Reasoning fails. This makes it a Case so very like the Modern Practice, that whosoever considers those Four Things, must be of an Opinion, that he cannot drink the *Cup of the Lord*, and the Cup of a *Departed Monarch.* And for the very Reason assign'd in that place by the Apostle, because that Action of Drinking when apply'd to the Remembrance of the Dead, is full of mysterious Signification, no less than the *Communion of the Blood of Christ*, &c.

Obj. 9. The Wine drank to the Glorious and Immortal Memory, &c. of K. *William*, is not consecrated, therefore 'tis not Sacramental. Who says it is? Therefore they don't drink it Religiously. Who says they do? No; but very irreligiously. Therefore they don't drink it, by way of Paying any Divine Honour. But 'tis strange they cannot

not see how they may Pay a Divine Honour, tho' they do not design it so ; and that it is true that in Fact they do so, tho' the Wine is not consecrated. The Question is, Whether Drinking in Remembrance of K. *William*, be not Paying him a Divine Honour, whether the Wine be consecrated, or no ; or whether they intend it, or not ? Nay, tho' they openly profess they design no Divine Honour ; as the Papists do, when they Pray to Saints, and prostrate themselves in a Posture of Adoration before Pictures, and Relicks, and Statues. The Question is not about the Bread, nor about the Wine, or about the Consecration of either, or no Consecration of them ; but about the Action of Drinking, apply'd to the Memory of the Dead ; the Using of Wine to that one Purpose ; whether this was consecrated, commanded, instituted, dedicated by Jesus Christ ? And if so ; whether the making the same Use of Wine, and applying that very one, only, particular, single Action, which, of all Actions on Earth, Christ has chosen to himself to perpetuate the Remembrance of him thro' all Generations of Christians ; may be apply'd to any other Person, without most horrid Desecration and Sacrilege ?

And therefore, here to obviate a Hundred Objections at once : Tho' Churches and Plate, say they, are consecrated to Divine Use, yet we may have Houses to live in,

we

we may uſe Plate, &c. in common Uſe. Yes, we may ſo. But to make the Objection full, and the Anſwer clear, let us take in Bread and Wine, which tho' conſecrated in the Euchariſt, yet we may uſe Bread and Wine for our ordinary Suſtenance. All this is granted: But then if any particular Houſe or Plate, &c. or Bread or Wine, is dedicated to God by Conſecration; then that Houſe, Plate, &c. Bread or Wine, may not be apply'd to common Uſe, without Deſecration and Sacrilege; and therefore what is left of the Bread and the Wine after Conſecration, are order'd by the Church to be eat and drank before the Congregation depart. And this ſhews the Force of all my Reaſoning upon this Subject; namely, becauſe that one particular Action of Drinking applied to the Memory of the Dead, is conſecrated into a Sacrament, and ſo dedicated to the Memory of Chriſt; therefore 'tis prophane and ſacrilegious to abuſe it to common Uſe: And more deteſtably ſo, than it poſſibly can be in any other Inſtance, except that of admitting Perſons into a viſible Body, by Dipping and Sprinkling. And why? Becauſe in all other Inſtances, the Conſecration is by Man; but in this one Inſtance, 'tis immediately by Chriſt himſelf, in his own Perſon, by a poſitive Command, and with expreſs Words of Inſtitution.

But, to carry this Objection as far as ever it will go, it may be ſaid, that the Action of Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, by being repeated, becomes a different Action; and ſo alters its Nature, as it is apply'd to God or Man. But it muſt be conſider'd, that if it is Ten Thouſand times repeated, and apply it how and where you will, 'tis the ſame Action ſtill; that very one, ſingle Action conſecrated to the Memory of Chriſt: And therefore there is no Similitude or Parity between this and a Houſe, or Bread, or Wine, or Plate, or any other thing dedicated or conſecrated to the Service of God. Nor can there be any Parallel, unleſs you ſuppoſe that there is but one Houſe, or Piece of Plate, or Cup of Wine, or Loaf of Bread in the World; and that too dedicated to God. And upon that Suppoſition, tho' that one thing might be of perpetual Uſe in the Worſhip of God; yet it wou'd be the higheſt Sacrilege to apply it in any other way. If there are Ten Thouſand Houſes, they are all different Houſes; and ſome may be apply'd to common Uſe, and others dedicated to the Service of God. But this being the ſame Action, tho' a Million of times repeated, which was conſecrated to the Memory of Chriſt, 'tis the higheſt Prophanation and Sacrilege to apply it to any other Perſon.

Now,

Now, as to all other Objections that may poſſibly be made, how many and of what Kind ſoever they are, I ſhall only deſire thoſe who make them, to poſſeſs their Minds with this one ſhort Truth; That the Action of *Drinking*, apply'd to the *Remembrance of the Dead*, is a Sacramental Action; and then they will anſwer themſelves: And all their Reaſonings muſt at laſt center in this, that what is now under the Goſpel become in its own Nature Sacramental, is moſt Holy; and therefore ought never to be us'd otherwiſe than Sacramentally; and that to uſe it otherwiſe, is moſt impious and abominable.

When all Objections are anſwer'd, and not one of theſe Arguments touched, ſays another, I do not ſee the Force of this Reaſoning. Then that is either becauſe of the natural Weakneſs, or the Prejudice of his Underſtanding: There may be ſome Excuſe for the firſt, but none for the latter. And therefore here what a Man hath to do, is, to be ſure that his Underſtanding is as weak as he thinks it; for otherwiſe he is inexcuſable. But ſtill ſome ſay, 'tis not my Opinion that there is any Ill in that Health; and therefore let them forbear it, who think there is. This is the moſt fatal and prevailing Error in the World, and the Rock upon which more Souls have been caſt away, than upon any other whatſoever. But

I muſt tell them another ſurpriſing Truth, and that is, that when thoſe who are in Error come to anſwer for their Souls before Jeſus Chriſt, the Queſtion will not be what Opinion they were of? and whether they acted according to that Opinion? But what Opinion they might and would have been of, if they had uſed their underſtanding Faculties with as much Humility, Diligence, and Impartiality in this matter, as they did in making a Bargain?

Is any thing plainer than the Nature of SCHISM; that it is a dangerous and crying Sin; and no leſs than a Man's cutting himſelf off from a Particular National Church, in which he may not only communicate without Sin, but arrive to the greateſt Perfection of Moral Virtue, and Evangelical Holineſs, that is by the Grace of God attainable in this Life; and that hereby he cuts himſelf off from the Body of the Catholick Church. And yet as obvious as this is, Multitudes build their Hopes of Salvation upon their not being of that OPINION, tho' at the ſame time they would not cut themſelves off from a Civil Corporation, in which they found their Account, for any Argument or Perſwaſion upon Earth: Nay, tho' all the Rules of it were not exactly agreeable to their Humour. And if they ſhould be over perſwaded at any time ſo to do, they would never hope for any Share

Share in the Privileges or Advantages of that Society.

Can any thing in all Religion be more obvious, than that worſhipping a Wafer is rank Idolatry ? and yet what Numbers are there in the World who do it habitually ? tho' God gave them their five Senſes on purpoſe to judge whether it is meer Bread or not; and their Reaſon to manage thoſe five Senſes to the beſt advantage ; and yet they will lay them all aſide in this moſt concerning and important Point ; when at the ſame time, all the Sophiſtry in the World cannot deceive them in a braſs Shilling.

And to give but one Inſtance more, is any thing more frequent among us, than for Men to profeſs themſelves of one Communion ; and yet ſpeak, and act thro' their whole Lives in favour of another ; to vilifie and expoſe it on all occaſions, and run into all Meaſures for the Encouragement and Support of Separation ? Tho' the being thus falſe to that Communion, in which they hope for Salvation, be a Folly monſtrous beyond expreſſion, yet how many lamentable Inſtances are there of it in the World ?

All theſe, 'tis true, are of their own OPINION, and profeſs to act according to it ; yet no indifferent Perſon can ſay, this will be any Excuſe for them in the Day of Judgment. And why ? Becauſe the Queſtion will not be whether SCHISM, and IDOLATRY,

LATRY, and that other Sin not to be comprehended in ONE WORD, were agreeable to their OPINION ; But whether they ſuffer'd themſelves to be ſo deceiv'd in any matter of this World ? Men are never blinded with ſuch Sophiſms in the common Affairs of Life ; and this will be the great Article of their Condemnation, who run into Errors in Religion thro' Wilfulneſs, or Prejudice, or Lazineſs, and want of Thinking.

Theſe are ſuch Objections as I have yet heard, and now what if there were not ſuch plain Proof for what I aſſert ; and ſuppoſe that all the Objections made, cou'd not thus be put in ſo clear a Light, as that every Capacity might apprehend the Weakneſs of them ; and that in that Action of drinking to the Memory of a dead Monarch, there were no more than a great *Similitude* or *Semblance* of that Action, which all allow to be Sacramental ; and that ſuch a Cuſtom were by ſome abuſed to ill Purpoſes, and may be yet farther abuſed ; and that ſuch a Practice had but an aſpect or tendency towards leſſening the Veneration of our moſt holy Euchariſt in the Hearts of People, as this plainly hath : Then I ask any plain ſincere Chriſtian of the Laity, who hopes for Pardon and Salvation by that Sacrament, whether if ſuch an Health were propos'd to him, he would not reject it with this Anſwer ; That he would be contented

tented to celebrate the Memory of K. *William* any way in the World, but with the ſame Action, and almoſt in the ſame Form of Words, by which he celebrates the Glorious Memory of his Bleſſed Saviour, and which was inſtituted and commanded by him for that very Purpoſe?

And ſince this Holy Euchariſt is the moſt Exalted Myſtery of our Religion, and become the moſt Solemn Act of Praiſe and Adoration; then let me ask you, my Brethren of the Clergy, who are *Stewards of the Myſteries of God*, Whether you can anſwer the Character of being *found faithful* to ſo great a Truſt, if by any Omiſſion or Neglect of yours, that Veneration and Reverence Men ought to have for it, be leſſened or impaired? If you ſuffer that very Action which is thus conſecrated to the Holy Jeſus, erected into a Sacrament, and fraught with Myſtery and Wonder even to the Angels, to be deſecrated and prophaned to common Uſe? But eſpecially, if by an eaſy Compliance with a Practice ſo highly ſinful, you lay a Stumbling-block in the Way of weaker Chriſtians, and betray them into what you ought to warn them of, and give them the greateſt Deteſtation and Abhorrence for? Remember, it will be no ſmall Article in the Account you are to give of your Stewardſhip, whether you exerted your ſelves with utmoſt Zeal, to keep up a pro-

profound Regard and Deference for this Ordinance of God, in the Hearts and Conſciences of Men? And I beſeech you, conſider how far you are like to fail in this, if you do not earneſtly endeavour to undeceive, and convince all ſuch as have been inſenſibly led into this Practice thro' Inadvertency, or want of Underſtanding, or ſufficiently Conſidering the true Nature of that moſt Holy Sacramental Action, which hath been proſtituted after ſuch an unbecoming and unſanctified manner.

I have purpoſely declined inſiſting long upon the Tendency this Health hath to leſſen that great Veneration and Eſteem we ought to have for our truly Pious and GLORIOUS QUEEN. For that the perpetual, noiſy, clamorous Sounding out the Praiſes of a dead Monarch, and in a Way which hath a SEMBLANCE at leaſt of Sacrificing to his Ghoſt, muſt have a malignant Influence upon the Loyalty of unwary Subjects, and naturally diſpoſe them for Faction and Sedition, is but too plain to be diſputed.

It may be ſaid here, That in Drinking this Health, they have nothing of that Deſign. I anſwer, As far as this can be ſaid with more or leſs Truth, ſo their Guilt is the greater, or the leſs. If they drank with that Deſign, it wou'd be plain Spreading Sedition, and Trumpeting Rebellion;

bellion ; and this wou'd be another grievous and horrid Aggravation of an Action, which was in its own Nature deteſtable before. This wou'd render it a crying Sin, of an enormous gygantick Size, with a great Variety and Complication of Guilt, made up of Impiety and Prophaneneſs towards God, Diſloyalty and Faction towards our Prince, and Contempt of all Laws Human and Divine.

'Tis true, many have been led into this Practice by Inadvertency, and for want of conſidering thoſe Views Men had who firſt ſet it on foot, and promoted it with a furious Zeal. But becauſe we are generally too apt to be miſtaken in our ſelves, and that *the Heart of Man is deceitful above all things*, I ſhall only make Two Obſervations in ſhort, which may be of Uſe for the Tryal of Men's Conſciences in this Point, and that they may be ſure upon what Principle they have induſtriouſly promoted this Health. Accordingly,

1*ſt*. If Men find in themſelves a ſincere Senſe of Obedience and Loyalty towards their preſent Monarch : If they Love and Honour Her MAJESTY, who is now Living, and Wiſh and Pray from their Hearts that She may be long ſo : If they can hear Her juſt Praiſes without Regret, and that the Recital of thoſe many Bleſ-

ſings She hath been the Inſtrument of to theſe Nations, gives them no Uneaſineſs; 'tis a good Sign that they did not promote and encourage this Health, with any evil Intent of caſting a Reflection upon the preſent Adminiſtration of Affairs; of ſowing Diſcord, and ſpreading Faction and Sedition; of making it a diſtinguiſhing TEST of a Party, which may grow ſtrong enough to bring all Things into Confuſion, that they may get above the Crowd, and render themſelves conſpicuous, by climbing up and trampling upon the Ruins of Church and State. But if they, of all People, ſhou'd chance to be noted for Failing in
* their Duty to HER who now fills the THRONE; and to turn all their Demonſtrations of Regard and Honour, of Reſpect and Veneration, I was juſt going to ſay, of Loyalty and Fidelity likewiſe, to a Monarch in the GRAVE; this wou'd be a ſtrong Preſumption, that 'tis all done with a very wicked Deſign: And the Thought is ſo natural, that People cou'd not then help imagining, that this was *Adoring* of Dead Kings, by way of *Rebelling* againſt the Living.

And here I cannot forbear obſerving, that
* LOYALTY, a Word in Uſe to comprehend all that Honour, Obedience, and Fidelity required in Scripture to be paid to Kings and Princes, is a Duty owing to the *Living*, and

and not to the *Dead*. *The Powers that be*, the Powers in Being, *are ordained of God*. And therefore that they, who look either backward or forward, ſo as to place their Hearts and Thoughts wholly upon any Predeceſſor or Succeſſor whatſoever, have great Reaſon to ſuſpect themſelves, and to fear that they are ſlipping their Time, and loſing their Seaſon for the Exerciſe of that Virtue of Loyalty; for the Violation of which, they will be one Day ſtrictly accountable, whatever Evaſion they now have from the Penalty of Human Laws. Their Time for this Duty is paſt as to K. *William*; and not yet come as to any, except our Preſent GLORIOUS QUEEN. Happy it is for them, who were not wanting in this Duty towards K. *William*, when he was Living; who are true to the *Succeſſion*, as by Law eſtabliſh'd in the Houſe of *HANOVER*, which they are ſworn to Maintain; and whenever the Providence of God ſhall call them to it, are ready to pay all that Honour and Fidelity, and Loyalty to the Next in that Line, which now, by the Laws of God and Man, is entirely owing to Her *Preſent Majeſty*. And he who cannot, from a Sincere and Loyal Heart, Pray that it may be *Long* ſo, may well ſuſpect that he fails in an indiſpenſible

Duty to his God, and to his Prince. He is much mistaken, if he fancies that a factious, discontented, murmuring Spirit will be changed with his Governor. No, this will ever be ready to discloſe it ſelf, whenever things go croſs to his Humour, or his Intereſt. # Loyalty, like all other Virtues, is to be acquired and ſtrengthened by Habit; and they who practiſe it in one Reign, are in the beſt Diſpoſition to continue it in another.

Now, becauſe the zealous Drinkers of # this Health do loudly diſclaim all Factious and Rebellious Deſigns in it, we muſt leave that to their own Conſciences, and to the Judgment of the great Day, when the *Secrets of all Hearts ſhall be reveal'd.* And to avoid any Imputation of Uncharitableneſs, let us ſuppoſe, that they have purſu'd this ſo warmly out of a miſtaken Zeal; through the Tranſports of their Souls, and an Exceſs of Gratitude to God; as thinking they can never be too thankful for all the Bleſſings theſe Nations have receiv'd before the Year Seventeen Hundred and Two. Or becauſe they think it time enough, ac- # cording to their Cuſtom, to recognize the Bleſſings of this Reign, under the next Monarch that comes; and then to change the Health into this Form, *Here is to the Glorious and Immortal Memory of* —— Or, like ſubtil Caſuiſts, to avoid the Prophaneneſs and Impiety of that Health, to turn it into

all

all that *Love and Honour* the *Glorious, Pious*, and *Immortal Memory of* ——— Or, to make themſelves very ſafe, to have it, *Here is to all that Lov'd* ——— *while Living, and Honour Her Memory now* ——— But to be ſure not to mean any Honourable REMEMBRANCE, when they drink. For if they ſhou'd, after all this Shifting and Turning, it will be in it ſelf the very ſame thing as if they worded it thus, *I take and drink this in Remembrance of K.* William. Or, *I take and drink this in Remembrance of* ——— So if they took a Piece of Bread, and eat it with this Expreſſion, *Here is to the Glorious and Immortal Memory*, &c. Or, *To all that Love and Honour the Memory*; It would be the very ſame thing as if they had ſaid, *I take and eat this in Remembrance*, &c. And why? Becauſe the *Action* of *Eating*, thus applied to the *Memory of the Dead*, is conſecrated by Chriſt to the Remembrance of himſelf, and made Sacramental. So that in each of theſe Inſtances, word it how they will, 'tis applying a moſt Holy Sacramental Action to Civil and Prophane Uſe.

It will be a good Indication of their being touched with a conſcientious Senſe of Religion towards God, and Loyalty to their Queen, if now they have ſeen the Prophane and Diſloyal Nature of this Health, they chuſe to ceaſe that Cuſtom, and find out ſome

ſome other Way of perpetuating the Memory of ſo great and publick a Benefactor as K. *William*, of leſs Danger to their own Souls; and without any ugly and invidious Glance at the Glories of the preſent Reign; which Poſterity will find many ways of Celebrating, when this Cuſtom of ſolemn Drinking to the Memory of the Dead (as it is the firſt Inſtance of it that ever was known in the Chriſtian World) will be tranſmitted down with the blackeſt Mark of Infamy, and be juſtly odious and deteſtable.

2*dly*, Another Head of Self-Examination, which I wou'd recommend here, is, Whether they who take Pains to diſtinguiſh themſelves by laying out much of their Zeal that way, do find in themſelves the like Fervency and Warmth in Drinking *in Remembrance* of Chriſt Jeſus; who is in a much more Exalted Senſe their *Saviour*, and their *King*. For if they, of all People, ſhould be remarkable for being negligent and ſcandalouſly Remiſs herein; this would make all thinking and obſerving Perſons look upon that prepoſterous Manner of Expreſſing their Regard for the Memory of a Dead Monarch, to be no other than a barefaced Hypocriſie, and loathſome Prevarication with God and Man. They wou'd be apt to ſuſpect, that it doth not proceed from any regard to *Governors*, whether *Living* or *Dead*; but is, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks

on

on that Occaſion, only *for a Cloak of Maliciouſneſs:* Not from any exceeding Gratitude for the Bleſſings of a former Reign; but from the height of Ingratitude for thoſe which have been heaped upon us in the preſent.

If it is objected by any, that the Word *Sacrament*, which I have made uſe of thro' this Diſcourſe, is not in Scripture; and therefore will not bear that ſtreſs which I have laid upon it. I anſwer, That this is a Term receiv'd by the whole Chriſtian Church to ſignifie an outward, viſible, bodily ACTION; inſtituted, appointed, ordained, eſtabliſhed, *&c.* by Jeſus Chriſt in his own Perſon; in full and expreſs Words of Inſtitution; and with a plain poſitive Command: and Men will never find out a more apt and ſignificant Word for that purpoſe. However, they who do not like it may lay it aſide, and take any other Word inſtead of it, more a greeable to their particular Humour; for let that be how it will, they muſt allow the THING to be Scriptural. So that when I ſay *Drinking in remembrance of the Dead*, is applying that outward bodily Action *Sacramentally*; my meaning is, that this is applying of it in that very way which was inſtituted, appointed, ordained, eſtabliſhed, *&c.* or any other Word they pleaſe. And that which makes this ſo horrid an Impiety, when 'tis done to any other Perſon, is becauſe tho' that bodily Action of Eating or Drinking is in its own

own nature as indifferent as Kneeling, Bowing, *&c.* and may be apply'd any other way; yet when apply'd to the *remembrance* of a Perſon dead, that outward Action is made a *Sign* and a *Seal* of the greateſt inward Grace and Favour that God cou'd beſtow upon Mankind; namely, of the *Communion* of that Body we remember, *i. e.* of all the Benefits of Chriſt's Death, Pardon of Sin, Reconciliation and Union with God, and everlaſting Life hereafter. And therefore how it comes to paſs, that the applying this outward Action in that very Form and Manner, which is now under the Goſpel render'd the moſt holy and ſtupendious Myſtery of Chriſtianity, any other way than according to the Inſtitution, ſhould prevail ſo commonly among Chriſtians; cannot but be, even to any obſerving Infidel, juſt matter of Wonder and Amazement.

FINIS.